



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/534,757

03/24/2000

Mark Edward Sweat

30566.79USUI

2752

22462

7590

01/31/2005

GATES & COOPER LLP  
HOWARD HUGHES CENTER  
6701 CENTER DRIVE WEST, SUITE 1050  
LOS ANGELES, CA 90045

EXAMINER

EDELMAN, BRADLEY E

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2153

DATE MAILED: 01/31/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Advisory Action**

Application No.

09/534,757

Applicant(s)

SWEAT ET AL.

Examiner

Bradley Edelman

Art Unit

2153

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 06 December 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

**PERIOD FOR REPLY** [check either a) or b)]

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires \_\_\_\_\_ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
- (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
- (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
- (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_.

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☒ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: see attached.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☐ will not be entered or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) rejected: 2-48.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

8. ☐ The drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.
10. ☒ Other: 892

### **DETAILED ACTION**

This Office action is in response to Applicant's arguments filed on December 6, 2004. Applicants arguments regarding the rejected claims are hereby considered.

#### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant makes the following arguments:

- a. Neither Doherty nor Glasser teach, disclose, or suggest an interactive web site configured to display drawings and text files.
- b. Neither Doherty nor Glasser teach, disclose, or suggest project folders and standard folders wherein project related administration tasks are not available for standard folders.
- c. Neither Doherty nor Glasser teach, disclose, or suggest the ability for a user on the web site to have the ability to modify and organize project members, and for the user to define access permissions for such project members to access project folders, standard folders, drawings, and text files.
- d. Doherty fails to disclose an activity log, as claimed in claim 10.
- e. Applicant further traverses Examiner's taking of Official notice with regard to claim 11. Examiner's assertion of Official notice was as follows: "filtering a list of items based on specified properties is well known in the computer arts."

Art Unit: 2153

In considering (a), Applicant contends that neither Doherty nor Glasser teach, disclose, or suggest an interactive web site configured to display drawings and text files. Examiner respectfully disagrees with this argument. Notably, Doherty describes giving authorized people access to specific project information on a secure Web site (page 1, ¶ 1), and further describes that the information includes specs, CAD, and product information (page 2, ¶ 1). In addition, Doherty discloses that the web site “cut[s] the cost of express mail, messengers, copies, and blueprints” (page 1, line 9). This description of project-specific web sites suggests that the web site can display drawings (CAD) and text files (specs).

In considering (b), Applicant contends that neither Doherty nor Glasser teach, disclose, or suggest project folders and standard folders wherein project related administration tasks are not available for standard folders. Examiner respectfully disagrees with this argument.

First, it is important to note the actual claim language. The claim states that “project related *administration tasks* are not available *when working with* the standard folders” (emphasis added). The phrase “administration tasks” is broad and undefined in the claim, and thus can include any tasks related to administering, managing, or otherwise organizing the project. Furthermore, the phrase “when working with” is vague in that it does not require that a user is accessing a standard folder, or is inside a standard folder. It only requires a relationship that when a user is working with one set of folders, the user does not have access to project related administration tasks.

In view of this claim construction, the combination of Doherty and Glasser does teach and suggest the claimed invention. Doherty discloses that the web site can be split up into different projects, and that a project manager can allow access to authorized members to specific projects (page 1, first paragraph, last paragraph). Glasser, which describes in more depth the types of access permissions that can be given to members of a collaborative online system, in addition to a folder structure for providing access to projects and administrative tasks (Fig. 4), describes that users working in the private folder can have access to both secret projects ("secret projects") and administrative tasks ("payroll" functions). It further discloses that users working in public, "standard," folders do not have access to those administrative tasks. Col. 6, line 55 – col. 7, line 40 describes this system. Thus, in the combined system of Doherty and Glasser discloses and suggests a system where project related administrative tasks are available if users a user is working with project folders, but are not available if a user is working with standard folders.

In considering (c), Applicant contends that neither Doherty nor Glasser teach, disclose, or suggest the ability for a user on the web site to have the ability to modify and organize project members, and for the user to define access permissions for such project members to access project folders, standard folders, drawings, and text files. Examiner respectfully disagrees. Notably, both Doherty and Glasser describe that different access permissions can be given to different users for different projects,

Art Unit: 2153

including project folders and standard folders and specific files, as described in the aforementioned sections of Doherty and Glasser.

In considering (d), Applicant contends that Doherty fails to disclose an activity log that captures activities of site members on the interactive web site, as claimed in claim 10. Examiner respectfully disagrees with this argument. Doherty discloses that the system includes "online forms and logs," "discussion threads," and "project progress information." See page 2, ¶ 1. Each of these can be construed as activity logs, because they capture activities of site members on the site (such as posts to the discussion thread, logs, and project progress resulting from site member activity). Thus, Doherty discloses the claimed activity log.

Regarding, Applicant's traversal of Examiner's taking of Official notice, note that Examiner's statement was simply that "filtering a list of items based on specified properties is well known in the computer arts." Note that the claim merely states "information in the activity log can be filtered based on one or more specified properties." The "activity logs" disclosed by Doherty include "online forms and logs," "discussion threads," and "project progress information." See page 2, ¶ 1. Examiner hereby supplies supporting evidence to the Official notice statement, notably that it is well known to filter a list of information or other information contained in a log (such as discussion threads/e-mails, file information, etc.) based on specified properties. For example, Glenn et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,907,677, describes that a filter "reviews e-mail

Art Unit: 2153

and newsgroup messages... by analyzing discussion threads in the actual e-mail and message content." Further, Christensen et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,055,543) describes that it is well known to search a group of files for specific content (Abstract). Such a search function constitutes "filtering information based on one or more specified properties." Thus, given this common knowledge in the art, it would have been obvious for a person viewing the activity logs taught by Doherty to filter through them according to specific criteria in order to quickly find those specified criteria.

In the event that this application is taken up on appeal, these references will be used as evidence to support the statements of Official notice taken.

For these reasons, and for the reasons given in the final office action sent on October 6, 2004, the claims remain rejected.

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Bradley Edelman whose telephone number is 571-272-3953. The examiner can normally be reached from 9 a.m. to 5 p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glen Burgess can be reached at 571-272-3949. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2153

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

*Bradley Edelman*

BE

January 28, 2005